



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/556,450

11/10/2005

Chee Yu Ng

853463.435USPC

3813

38106

7590

03/09/2009

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 5400
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

STIGLIC, RYAN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2111

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/09/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/556,450</p>	<p>Applicant(s) NG ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner RYAN M. STIGLIC</p>	<p>Art Unit 2111</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Paul R. Myers/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2111

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends that Wang does not teach a host controller adapted to act only as a slave. Wang clearly discloses and applicant agrees (see page 10 of the Remarks) that "The host controller system 100 does not have a bus mastering ability [paragraph 0138]. Wang goes on to say "As discussed above, however, with embedded systems, the system bus is only under the control of the host microprocessor" [see paragraph 0138]. As a result Wang discloses the use of an "interrupt-driven USB Engine 168 in conjunction with the host controller system 100" [see paragraph 0139]. The "USB Engine 168 makes use of the interrupt from the host controller system 100 to activate an interrupt handler routine which pushes transaction descriptors 110 and data from the microprocessor 102 system memory to the host controller system 100 memory and pulls transaction status and data from the host controller system 100 memory to the microprocessor 102 system memory" [see paragraph 0140]. Thus it is unmistakable that the host controller system does not have bus mastering capabilities and thus only acts as a bus slave on the system/processor bus. Regarding the combination of Wang and Hamdi not teaching a direct connection to a memory bus, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant contends "Wang's interrupt driven system requires host controller 100 to interrupt host microprocessor 24 so that the host microprocessor 24 can write data. Hamdi's bus mastering system requires host controller 608 to control the bus, which will stall microprocessor 602" (see page 11 of the Remarks). The proposed combination of Wang and Hamdi would move the system memory 32 onto the host processor bus 31 in order to reduce access latency (acknowledged by applicant on page 11 of the Remarks, "It is not disputed that Hamdi reduces access latency in the host controller by providing direct connection between system and the host controller"). The Examiner is not relying on the functionality of the host controller of Hamdi in any way. Furthermore, applicant's argument that Hamdi's host controller, implemented in the system of Wang, would have bus mastering capabilities is a strict contradiction to paragraph [0138] of Wang that says in embedded systems [like that shown in figure 1A of Wang] the system bus is ONLY controlled by the host microprocessor. Therefore, the host controller of Hamdi would lose its bus mastering capabilities.